



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,480	07/03/2001	Michio Matsuura	1083.1082	2498
21171	7590	09/12/2005		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER SHIFERAW, ELENIA	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/897,480

Applicant(s)

MATSUURA ET AL.

Examiner

Eleni A. Shiferaw

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1-3, 7-8, 10, 12, and 15-20, added claim 21, and presently pending claims 1-21, filed on April 28, 2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. The examiner accepts the amended specification/abstract.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11, 15-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peinado et al. (Peinado, Patent No. US 6,772,340 B1) in view of Spruit et al. (Spruit, Pub. No.: US 2001/0030932 A1).

As per claim 1, Peinado teaches a contents processing method comprising the steps of:

storing contents in advance (Fig. 1 element 12, and col. 7 lines 8-24; **Peindo's digital content is stored unencrypted in advance and unencrypted digital content is extracted and**

**encrypted by authoring tool, according to an encryption/decryption key or instructions and/or rules that accompany the digital content, on users request);**

extracting the stored contents (Peinado col. 7 lines 8-24, col. 8 lines 34-67, and col. 19 lines 48-60);

encrypting the extracted contents (Peinado Col. 5 lines 14-29, col. 7 lines 8-24, and col. 2 lines 56-67);

recording the encrypted contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20);

accepting a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, and col. 5 lines 14-30);

recording the accepted limiting condition on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 14-30, and col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4); and

reproducing, displaying or executing the contents recorded on the medium while decrypting the contents based on the identifier under the recorded limiting condition (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID", and col. 19 lines 48-col. 20 lines 4).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium as amended.

However Spruit discloses encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium (page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29; unique serial number is provided to

user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 2, Peinado teaches a contents processing system comprising:

a recording device for recording contents on a medium (Peinado Col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20); and

an execution device for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 5-19, col. 3 lines 57-67, and Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID"),

wherein the recording device includes a processor capable of performing the following operations:

storing contents in advance in conjunction with first specifying information for specifying the contents (Peinado Col. 41 lines 12-20);

accepting first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

extracting the stored contents, based on the accepted first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

recording the encrypted contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20);

accepting a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, and col. 5 lines 14-30); and

recording the accepted limiting condition on the medium (Peinado Col. 19 lines 48-60),

wherein the execution device includes a processor capable of performing the following operations:

reading the identifier of the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, and Fig. 17 No. 1715);

decrypting the contents recorded on the medium in an encrypted form, based on the read identifier (Peinado Cig. 14 No. 1405, and Abstract); and

reproducing, displaying or executing the decrypted contents under the limiting condition recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, and Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID").

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting the extracted contents, based on the read identifier.

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium

(page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claims 7 and 16, Peinado discloses a recording device for recording contents on a medium, comprising:

- means for storing the contents in advance in conjunction with first specifying information for specifying the contents (Peinado Col. 9 lines 58-67, and Fig. 1 No. 22);
- means for accepting first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);
- means for accepting fees for recording the contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 10 lines 4-18;
- means for extracting the stored contents, based on the accepted first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17); and
- means for recording the encrypted contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 7 lines 37-col. 8 lines 13, col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach means for reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and means for encrypting the extracted contents, based on the read identifier;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 8, Peinado discloses a recording device for recording contents on a medium, comprising a processor capable of performing the following operations:

storing contents in advance in conjunction with first specifying information for specifying the contents (Peinado Col. 41 lines 12-20);

accepting first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

extracting the stored contents, based on the accepted first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

recording the encrypted contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20);

accepting a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, and col. 5 lines 14-30); and

recording the accepted limiting condition on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 14-30, and col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting the extracted contents, based on the read identifier;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 10, and 17, Peinado discloses an execution device for reproducing, displaying or executing contents recorded on a medium, comprising:

means for reproducing, displaying or executing the decrypted contents under a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID", and col. 19 lines 48-col. 20 lines 4).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach means for reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and means for decrypting contents, which have been encrypted based on the identifier and recorded, based on the read identifier;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium, encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a

Art Unit: 2136

medium, and decrypting contents, which have been encrypted based on the identifier and recorded, based on the read identifier (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 27-32; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium and encrypted data is decrypted).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 15, Peinado discloses a contents processing system comprising:

a recording device for recording contents on a medium (Peinado Col. 7 lines 37-col. 8 lines 13, col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20); and

an execution device for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 5-19, col. 3 lines 57-67, and Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID"), wherein the recording device includes:

means for storing the contents in advance in conjunction with first specifying information for specifying the contents (Peinado Col. 9 lines 58-67, and Fig. 1 No. 22);

means for accepting first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

means for extracting the stored contents, based on the accepted first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

means for recording the encrypted contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20);

means for accepting a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 14-30, and col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4); and

means for recording the accepted limiting condition on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4 and Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID"),

wherein the execution device includes:

means for reading the identifier of the medium (Peinado Col. 7 lines 37-col. 8 lines 13);

means for decrypting contents recorded on the medium in an encrypted form, based on the read identifier (Peinado Abstract, and Fig. 14 No. 1405); and

means for reproducing, displaying or executing the decrypted contents under the limiting condition recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID", and col. 19 lines 48-col. 20 lines 4).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach means for

reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and means for encrypting the extracted contents, based on the read identifier;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 18, Peinado discloses a computer memory product readable by a computer and storing a computer program for recording contents on a medium, the computer program comprising:

storing the contents in advance in conjunction with first specifying information for specifying the contents; accepting first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 58-67, and Fig. 1 No. 22);

extracting the stored contents, based on the accepted first specifying information  
(Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

recording the encrypted contents on the medium (Peinado Col. 2 lines 56-67, and col. 41 lines 12-20);

accepting a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents  
(Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, and col. 5 lines 14-30); and

recording the accepted limiting condition on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 14-30, and col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting the extracted contents, based on the read identifier;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting

content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 19, Peinado teaches a computer memory product readable by a computer and storing a computer program for reproducing, displaying or executing contents recorded on a medium, the computer program comprising the steps of:

reproducing, displaying or executing the decrypted contents under a limiting condition for reproducing, displaying or executing the contents recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67, Fig. 1 No. 20 "Content ID", and col. 19 lines 48-col. 20 lines 4).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium and decrypting contents, which have been encrypted based on the identifier and recorded, based on the read identifier;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium, encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium, and decrypting contents, which have been encrypted based on the identifier and recorded, based on the read identifier (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 27-32; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium and encrypted data is decrypted).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 21, Peinado discloses a content processing system, comprising:

a recording device including a processor capable of storing contents in advance, extracting the stored contents and encrypting the extracted contents (Fig. 1 element 12, and col. 7 lines 8-24; **Peindo's digital content is stored unencrypted in advance and unencrypted digital content is extracted and encrypted by authoring tool, according to an encryption/decryption key or instructions and/or rules that accompany the digital content, on users request**);

an execution device including a processor capable of decrypting the contents recorded on the user medium and reproducing, displaying or executing the contents recorded on the medium (Peinado Col. 3 lines 57-67).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to the content service provider and content server provider provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach

encrypting content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a user medium, and decrypting based on the read identifier having been given uniquely to the medium.

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium, encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium, and decrypting contents, which have been encrypted based on the identifier and recorded, based on the read identifier (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 27-32; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium and encrypted data is decrypted).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

As per claim 3, Peinado discloses the contents processing system, further comprising a central device connected to the recording device and the execution device via a communication network, wherein

the processor of the execution device is further capable of performing the following operations:

accepting first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);  
accepting second specifying information for specifying a recording device in  
which the contents are to be recorded (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17); and  
transmitting the accepted first specifying information, second specifying  
information and the identifier given to the medium to the central device (Peinado  
Col. 9 lines 1-17, and col. 18 lines 50-col. 19 lines 60),

wherein the central device includes a processor capable of performing the following  
operations:

extracting contents from a content database storing contents, based on the  
transmitted first specifying information (Peinado Col. 8 lines 34-67, and col. 19  
lines 48-60); and  
transmitting the extracted contents and the transmitted identifier to a recording  
device corresponding to the transmitted second specifying information (Peinado  
Col. 9 lines 1-17, and col. 18 lines 50-col. 19 lines 60, and col. 55 lines 63-col. 56  
lines 2), and

the processor of the recording device is further capable of performing the following  
operations:

storing the transmitted contents in the content file in conjunction with the  
identifier (Peinado Col. 41 lines 12-20); and  
extracting the contents from the content file based on the identifier of the medium  
(Peinado Col. 8 lines 34-67, and col. 19 lines 48-60).

As per claim 4, Peinado discloses the contents processing system or the central device,  
wherein the contents are web pages, and the first specifying information is a search  
keyword for searching for web pages (Peinado Col. 4 lines 4-57), and

the processor of the central device extracts a web page corresponding to the transmitted  
search keyword and web pages linked to the web page from the content database, based on the  
search keyword, for extraction of the contents (Peinado Col. 14 lines 4-65).

As per claim 5, Peinado discloses the contents processing system or the central device,  
wherein the processor of the central device is further capable of performing an operation  
of accepting a limit number of times for limiting the number of times of linking between the web  
page corresponding to the search keyword and web pages linked to the web page (Peinado Col.  
14 lines 4-34, col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4), and

the processor of the central device extracts the web page corresponding to the transmitted  
search keyword and web pages linked to the web page within the accepted limit number of times  
from the content database, based on the search keyword, for extraction of the contents (Peinado  
col. 14 lines 4-34).

As per claim 6, Peinado discloses the contents processing system of claim 5,  
wherein the processor of the execution device is further capable of performing an  
operation of transmitting a URL of a web page which is not stored on the medium to the  
central device when the web page is to be displayed on a browser (Peinado Col. 14 lines

4-34, col. 55 lines 63-col. 56 lines 2).

As per claim 9, Peinado discloses the recording device, wherein the processor is further capable of performing the following operations:

storing transmitted contents and the identifier from the outside in a content file in conjunction with each other (Peinado Col. 9 lines 58-67, Fig. 1 No. 22, and col. 55 lines 64-col. 56 lines 2); and

extracting the contents from the content file, based on the identifier of the medium (Peinado Col. 7 lines 37-col. 8 lines 13).

As per claim 11, Peinado discloses the execution device, wherein the processor is further capable of performing the following operations:

accepting first specifying information for specifying the contents (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17);

accepting second specifying information for specifying other computer in which the contents are to be recorded (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17); and

transmitting the accepted first specifying information and second specifying information and the read identifier of the medium to the outside (Peinado Col. 55 lines 63-col. 56 lines 2, and col. 9 lines 1-17, and col. 18 lines 50-col. 19 lines 60).

5. Claims 12-14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peinado et al. (Peinado, Patent No. US 6,772,340 B1) and Spruit et al. (Spruit, Pub. No.: US 2001/0030932 A1), and further in view of Tanaka (Pub. No.: US 2003/0208766 A1).

As per claims 12 and 20, Peinado discloses a central device or a computer memory product for transmitting contents to another computer connected via a communication network, comprising a processor capable of performing the following operations:

accepting first specifying information for specifying contents, second specifying information for specifying a computer in which the contents are to be recorded (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17), transmitted from the outside (Peinado Col. 8 lines 3-13, and Col. 55 lines 63-col. 56 lines 2);

extracting contents from a content database storing contents, based on the accepted first specifying information (Peinado Col. 9 lines 1-17); and

transmitting the extracted contents and the identifier to a computer associated with the second specifying information (Peinado Col. 11 lines 41-57).

Peinado teaches content protection method, wherein user-device requests content online to content service provider and content server provides the requested content by encrypting the content based on identified user-device request. Peinado fails to explicitly teach and an identifier given uniquely to each medium;

However Spruit discloses reading an identifier having been given uniquely to the medium (page 1 par. 0006 lines 1-7), encrypting digital content based on an identifier having been given uniquely to a medium, and decrypting contents, which have been encrypted based on the

identifier and recorded, based on the read identifier (page 2 par. 0013 lines 25-39, and page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 27-32; unique serial number is provided to user medium (optical disk, DVD) at manufacturing process and content provider encrypts content data based on unique serial number of the medium and encrypted data is decrypted).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Spruit within the system of Peinado because they are analogous art in copy right protection (Spruit page 1 par. 0005 lines 1-10 and page 3 par. 0029 lines 27-29). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of encrypting content data based on medium identifier because it would enhance security. Content can only be decrypted when the identifier/serial number corresponds to the key of the data (page 3-4 par. 0029 lines 30-32).

Peinado and Spruit disclose all the subject matter as described above. Peinado and Spruit fail to explicitly teach another computer (central device) to receive and provide content request from and to the requester, in working with a third server (content provider).

However Tanaka discloses first, second and third terminals (fig. 8). The third terminal sends content request to the second terminal and second terminal provides the requested content based on the requested information in conjunction with first terminal (page 1 par. 0014, and page 4 par. 0067-0069).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka within the combination system of Peinado and Spruit because they are analogous art in content providing (page 1 par. 0011). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of central

device/second terminal between users and content provider/third terminal because performing sub-tasks on many computers would provide high performance.

As per claim 13, Peinado, spruit and Tanaka teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Peinado discloses the contents processing system or the central device,

wherein the contents are web pages, and the first specifying information is a search keyword for searching for web pages (Peinado Col. 4 lines 4-57), and

the processor of the central device extracts a web page corresponding to the transmitted search keyword and web pages linked to the web page from the content database, based on the search keyword, for extraction of the contents (Peinado Col. 14 lines 4-65).

As per claim 14, Peinado, spruit and Tanaka teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Peinado discloses the contents processing system or the central device,

wherein the processor of the central device is further capable of performing an operation of accepting a limit number of times for limiting the number of times of linking between the web page corresponding to the search keyword and web pages linked to the web page (Peinado Col. 14 lines 4-34, col. 19 lines 61-col. 20 lines 4), and

the processor of the central device extracts the web page corresponding to the transmitted search keyword and web pages linked to the web page within the accepted limit number of times from the content database, based on the search keyword, for extraction of the contents (Peinado col. 14 lines 4-34).

*Conclusion*

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eleon Shiferaw



Art Unit 2136

September 1, 2005

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100